

Appl. No. 10/798,927  
Response dated July 11, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of January 12, 2005

### REMARKS

The revised drawing for Figures 1-19 have been submitted herewith.

The structure in U.S. Patent No. 701,571 ('571) is considerably different from the present invention. In the '571 patent the purpose is to set a top sail from one side of a gaff and spring and jack stays between two masts to the other side thereof. The present invention is for example a Marconi rig, with a mast, without a gaff, and spring and jack stays, and more importantly, the purpose is to reduce the stored height of the sail on the mast. The structure of the '571 patent is different from that of the present invention due to the totally different purposes. In the '571 patent, there are two upper tracks, one on each side of the gaff, to fly the top sail thereon. In the present invention while there are two lower tracks they are not for flying the sail, but for storing the sail. In contrast the '571 patent has but one pivoting lower track. Whereas the '571 patent has two upper tracks to fly the sail, one on each side of the gaff, spring and jack stays, the present invention has but one upper track for flying the sail on its mast. In short, the two inventions are quite different. While both have some sort of shifting switch, the '571 has a single pivoting lower track which switches between two upper tracks, while in the present invention the switching is between one or the other of the lower storage tracks, and the single upper track for flying the sail.

Even Claim 1 as filed clearly distinguishes from the '571 reference. That claim calls for "An apparatus for stacking sail cars...." That is NOT the purpose of the '571 patent. The '571 patent has two upper tracks one on each side of the spring and jumper stays and golf, it does not

Appl. No. 10/798,927  
Response dated July 11, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of January 12, 2005

have the single "vertical upper section" of Claim 1.... The '571 patent does NOT meet the limitation of "a lower section including at least a port and starboard tracks (sic). Nor does it have "the cars each having guide structure (now in amended Claim 1, "guide means") thereon for guiding cars to opposite tracks of the lower section...." Nor does the '571 "effectively reducing the vertical height of the stacked cars when the sail is stowed." In addition new Claims 4-39, all dependent directly or indirectly from amended Claim 1 have been added, and call for additional details of the present invention. These claims too are clearly distinguishable from the cited reference. Likewise, Claims 2 (amended) and 3 also distinguish from the cited reference. An additional detailed independent Claim 40 has also been added.

It is believed that all of the Claims 1-40 are allowable over the cited art.

It is believed that all matters raised by the Office Action have been addressed. Allowance of Claims 1-40 is courteously requested. Should the undersigned have been mistaken and some issue not been addressed, or the Examiner believes a telephone interview would expedite prosecution, the undersigned would appreciate the Examiner initiating a telephone interview.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Michael Piontek", written in dark ink.

Michael Piontek, Reg. No.: 25.605  
Attorney for Applicant  
Pyle & Piontek  
221 N. LaSalle Street, Suite 850  
Chicago, Illinois 60601  
(312) 236-8123

Appl. No. 10/798,927  
Response dated July 11, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of January 12, 2005

**Amendments to the Drawings:**

The attached sheets of drawings include changes to Figures 1-19. These sheets replace the original sheets which include Figures 1-19.